



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/209,015	12/10/1998	NATHAN ABRAMSON	101.957.156	8933

7590

04/19/2002

MICHAEL A DIENER
HALE AND DORR
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ROSSI, JEFFREY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/209,015

Applicant(s)

ABRAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

ROSSI A J.

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 ~~is/are~~ pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) NONE ~~is/are~~ withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 ~~is/are~~ rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the following communications: the amendment "a", filed 01-17-2002, and the application, filed 12-19-1998.
2. The disposition of claims is as follows: claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1,12, & 16 are independent. Claims 1, 12, and 16 have been amended.
3. The group art unit of the Examiner handling your case has changed. The current art unit is 2176. Use of this number on all correspondence helps us route communications to your case.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention.
5. Dependent claims rejected under this rubric are rejected based on their dependency on a rejected parent claim.

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the software component" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Per independent claim 16, the use of "input names be correctly named" is vague and indefinite. The metes and bounds of this claim language cannot be properly ascertained, because there is not sufficient guidance as to how "correctly named" should be interpreted. Applicant's use of this terminology appears paradoxal, because if the program works, variables would appear to be de facto correctly named, at least in one sense of the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/44695 to Apple Computer, Inc..

Claim dependency has been indicated in parentheses () as shorthand, and as a convenience for Applicants and as a reminder that the rejection of a dependent claim *implicitly* incorporates all elements of the rationale of the rejected base claim, *supra*.

11. Per independent claim 1; APPLE COMPUTER, INC discloses the claimed method for mapping input fields in a hypertext document including emitting program code for mapping software :

mapping (claimed mapping refers to ‘action bindings **402** consist of a mapping between an event that Applet **201** triggers, for example... and an action on a server’—page 23, lines 13-15) input field names (“name”--Table one; “INPUTFIELD”)) in a hypertext document to component properties when the hypertext document is rendered (refer to ‘keys’ that represent the data or state managed by applets **701**—page 23, lines 7-9; ‘ key is bound to a specific object or variable **704** in the server’—page 23, lines 10-12; (an example of a name for the variable is *approx.* line 10 on the TABLE, page 15; also “The dictionary {or snapshot of the keys and their current values} is used upon invocation of an action”—page 26, lines 7-10), the software component being a server based component (“application logic in the server”--abstract);
providing the rendered hypertext document to a user (HTML—page 15)

Art Unit: 2176

receiving from the user input field data in a named input field ('inputfield'—TABLE—page 15; and

using the mapping to determine an appropriate component property ('declarations file... provide declarations for the tag... initialize instance variables of an object and provide runtime information'—page 15, lines 34-35, See also TABLE 2) for the named input field and to call component methods for processing the input field data ('method 703 on the server is invoked'—page 23, lines 18-19), the mapping being done such that the software component can process the input field regardless of the spelling of the name in the hypertext document (APPLE COMPUTER, INC does not put a restriction on the "name" field, this is processed regardless of its spelling.

12. Per dependent claim 2 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: wherein the rendering includes emitting hypertext form tags with a current value of an inputfield pre-filled in ('List applet' {a list of items}'—page 21, lines 10-11; 'pull-down lists'—page 6, line 7).

13.. Per dependent claim 3 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: , wherein the mapping includes encoding the hypertext input form with a unique name ('name'—Table One) and registering the name (The WEBOBJECT tags in Table 1... provide a pointer to entries in a declarations file"—page 15, lines 31-35; the name having a value of 'inputfield' ... binds itself to the inputfield entry of the declarations file'—page 16, lines 32-35).

14. Per dependent claim 5 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: wherein the program code is source code of a compiled programming language ("the invention can be practiced using other languages such as Objective C, C++...). *Note claims 5-8 have been given "broadest*

Art Unit: 2176

reasonable interpretation” based on a guess of Applicant’s intended claim construction. See rubric “112 Rejections”, supra.

15. Per dependent claim 6 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: wherein the program code is source code of a compiled programming language wherein the program code is source code of an interpreted programming language (“interpretative languages”, “... scripts are typically used to provide the logic associated with a Web page”, see also table 3—page 18, lines 9, 13-17 *et seq.*).

16. Per dependent claim 7 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses : claimed ‘ wherein the program code is object code of a compiled programming language’ (“the invention can be practiced using other languages such as Objective C, C++...).

6. Per dependent claim 8 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses:, wherein the program code is object code of an interpreted programming language (“interpreted at runtime”—page 18, line 11).

9. Per dependent claim 9 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: claimed ‘converting the submitted input field data to a correct data type’ (“HTML elements {including applets} are mapped to objects in an object-oriented environment”—page 14, liens 10-13).

17. Per independent claim 12 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC discloses claimed system for mapping hypertext input fields to software components comprising:

a preprocessor (In the reference as applied the claimed preprocessor is the CPU used to generate the code in table One, e.g., WEBOBJECT
name=INPUTFIELD></WEBOBJECT>... THE ABOVE HTML template includes tags for

Art Unit: 2176

HTML, HEAD, BODY, and WEBOBJECT elements”—page 15, lines 23-25) for generating program code to register mappings between hypertext input field names and component properties and to emit hypertext form tags (authoring tool inherent in APPLE’s teaching relied upon, *supra.*) ;

a name-space manager (*i.e.*, Associations **302**—page 22, line 9 *et seq.* in conjunction with Action Coordinator **301**; See also Applet group Controller—page 8, lines 19-20; “declarations file”—page 17, line 15 *et seq.*) for registering the mappings (Associations **302** and applets **201** include the ability to obtain the applet’s keys, obtain the key values”—page 22, lines 19-20; State bindings **401** include a list of ‘keys’ that represent the data or state managed by applets **701**... a key is bound to a specific object or variable **704** in the server to which it is synchronized”—page 23, lined 10-11; “Initially, when page is generated, all the state [sic.] for which there are state bindings are sent to the client... This initial synchronization ensures that the server’s data is used to initialize the web page”—page 20, lines 15-20; “initialize instance variables of an object”—page 15, line 35; and rendering the document so that the document can be provided to a user (TABLE ONE); and

a data handler (Applet Group Controller, Action Controller **301**), responsive to submitted input data with an input field name submitted by a user, for using the mappings to associate input field names with component properties (“HTML elements {including applets} are mapped to objects in an object oriented environment”—page 14, lines 9-11), and for calling appropriate component methods for processing the input data (“The server invokes the appropriate functions using the values transmitted from the Action Coordinator”—page 9, lines 3-

Art Unit: 2176

5) the mapping being done such that the software component can process the input field regardless of the spelling of the name in the hypertext document (APPLE COMPUTER, INC does not put a restriction on the “name” field, this is processed regardless of its spelling).

18. Per dependent claim 13 (12), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses: ‘wherein the data handler converts the submitted input data to a correct data type’ (“HTML elements {including applets} are mapped to objects in an object-oriented environment”—page 14, lines 10-13).

19. Per independent claim 16, APPLE COMPUTER, INC discloses a method comprising processing a hypertext document by identifying and storing input field names before sending the document to a user (“declarations file”—page 19, line 13; “key value pairs **701**”—page 23; lines 10-11”) “Association **302** is then connected to an applet **201** at step 507... At step **508**, all of the initial values {e.g., passed in through parameter tags in the HTML document} are extracted... The initial values are then placed into a dictionary of values located on the client’s computer. The dictionary {or snapshot of the keys and their current values} upon invocation of an action”—page 26, lines 5-10) is used, and in response to receiving input data with input field names from the user, determining appropriate software component methods (method **703**—FIG. 7) for processing the input data by looking to the stored input field names (“This dictionary ... is used upon invocation of an action”—page 26, lines 6-10), whereby the input names for the input data are determined from the document without requiring that the names be named correctly (“name”, and “Inputfield” can be any name selected by the user) Each association **302** has the ability to obtain and set states for its corresponding applets **201** at runtime... Associations **302** and applets **201** include the ability to obtain the applets keys, obtain the key’s values, and invoke an

Art Unit: 2176

applet's action"—page 22, lines 15-20 *et seq.*; "Classes of objects are defined {in a declarations file} for each HTML element as well as the HTML template or page... At runtime, instances of the object classes are instantiated for the HTML elements defined in the HTML document"—page 14, lines 9-14 & 20-24)"). Note that the claimed software methods being referred to are the methods running remotely on the server ("... invocation of methods on the server... using Action Bindings 402"—page 23, lines 1-5), . Per ""requiring input names be correctly named", there is no requirement that the user of the Apple product be named, for example, as a correctly spelled word. In fact it is implicit in the disclosure that the user could name the inputfield whatever he/ she wishes. In considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account the inferences which one skilled in the art would be reasonably expected to draw therefrom--In re Prada, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA1968) cited in MPEP 2144.01

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

21. Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 98/44695 to Apple Computer, Inc.

22. Per dependent claim 10 (1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further discloses wherein the determining includes iteratively processing input names associated with a component property to determine if data associated with any of the input names has been entered. (*inherent* in “Before an action is invoked in the server, any state that has changed in the client is transmitted back to the server {e.g., state may change when a browser user enters information in an input field of the web page}”—page 20, lines 20-25. The “inherence” relied upon is due to the observation that CPU processed data in clock cycles, and the ONLY way for the CPU to detect a state change would have been to continually check for the state change; See also “a timer may be utilized such that synchronization is to occur every {5} seconds”—page 21, lines 1-3). Should Applicant dispute the inherence of the claimed iterations, it would have been obvious to a **Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art**, *i.e.*, PHOSITA at the time of the invention to iterate APPLE because it was suggested on page 21, lines 1-3, and in order to ensure synchronization as described by APPLE (“synchronization”—page 20, lines 19-23 *et seq.*)

23. Per dependent claim 14 (12), APPLE COMPUTER, INC, further suggests claimed : wherein the name-space manager includes a table for mapping a form to input field” (claimed table is *implicit* in mapping) , and for mapping input fields to a component property (*idem*). Should Applicants disagree that Apple explicitly discloses this claim limitation; “Official Notice” is hereby taken that it was notoriously well-known to map using a table. It would therefore have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to employ tables in the mapping of APPLE

Art Unit: 2176

COMPUTER, INC, in order to efficiently perform the look-up function inherent in the mapping of APPLE COMPUTER, INC, in order to reduce space.

24. Claims 4, 11, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/44695 to Apple Computer, Inc.

25. Claim dependency has been indicated in parentheses () as shorthand, and as a convenience for Applicants and as a reminder that the rejection of a dependent claim *implicitly* incorporates all elements of the rationale of the rejected base claim, *supra*.

26. Per dependent claim 4(1), APPLE COMPUTER, INC; lacks an explicit recitation of the receiving includes determining if the user submitted input field data is from a hypertext input form and bypassing input field processing if the determination cannot be made. However, it is suggested by APPLE COMPUTER, INC that “upon specified events on a browser by the user... certain actions may need to occur on a server. The present invention provides for the recognition of these events... and the invocation of the actions in the server. Therefore, since events are triggered by, for example, filling out a form it is suggested that if the determination of the filling of the form cannot be completed the action associated with the field will not be executed. It would therefore have been obvious to a **Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art**, *i.e.*, PHOSITA at the time of the invention to bypass input field processing if no input to an HTML field is detected.

27. Per independent claim 11, APPLE COMPUTER, INC demonstrates all elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 10, *supra*. “wherein the determining includes

Art Unit: 2176

processing in order of priority stored with the mapping of the input field names”, APPLE COMPUTER, INC., lacks an explicit recitation of this feature. However, a priority of input fields is implied, because Action Coordinator 301 processes plural input fields, and because it processes “only those values that have changed since the last communication with the browser are compiled into the package”—page 29, lines 1-10. It is further implied in the observation that input field value mappings would not have been processed randomly, thus there is in inherent order. Since “priority” is generically claimed, it is believed that APPLE COMPUTER, INC implicitly meets this limitation. Otherwise, it would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to process input fields in a prioritized order in order to give preference to the executions of certain actions over others.

28. Per dependent claim 15(12), APPLE COMPUTER, INC further suggests , wherein the name-space manager includes a *table* for mapping a form to input fields as described in detail in the rejection of dependent claim 14, *supra*. and for mapping input fields to a priority that determines the order in which the data handler processes the input field mappings. However per prioritizing the processing of mapping of the input field names”, APPLE COMPUTER, INC., lacks an explicit recitation of this feature. A priority of input fields is implied, because Action Coordinator 301 processes plural input fields, and because it processes “only those values that have changed since the last communication with the browser are compiled into the package”—page 29, lines 1-10. It is further implied in the observation that input field value mappings would not have been processed randomly, thus there is in inherent order. Since “priority” is generically claimed, it is

Art Unit: 2176

believed that APPLE COMPUTER, INC implicitly meets this limitation. Otherwise, it would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to process input fields in a prioritized order in order to give preference to the executions of certain actions over others.

29. Per dependent claim 17; which depends on dependent claim 16 detailed, *supra*, the rational, including method and motivation for combination and achieving claimed “priority” are substantially identical to that as set forth in the rejection of independent claim 16, *supra*.

Therefore, a significant copy/paste is hereby avoided by explicit incorporation of the rationale set forth with regard to the “priority” described in the rationale regarding claims 14-15, *supra*.

Response to Remarks of 01-17-2001.

In the remarks of 01-17-2001, applicant argued in substance the following points.

- a) [moot in light of withdrawal of rejections under 35 USC, first paragraph]
- b) If inputfield is misspelled in the HTML file, a link to that declaration will not be made.

Response

30. Applicant's arguments filed 01-17-2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted, however, that they principally rely on new claim amendments addressed, *supra*.

Art Unit: 2176

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., if the name is misspelled) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, the "name" on Table One can be spelled any way the user desires. Further, the Examiner disagrees that INPUTFIELD must be correctly spelled. This is the exemplary embodiment, however, INPUTFIELD could be a misspelled word, e.g., INPTFLD, and still have operated as described. The Applicant appears to be relying on features which are not claimed.

Further, it is noted that "*can* process the input field data.... regardless" is not necessarily a positive recitation of the claimed element, because it suggested only that the claimed elements may have been adaptable to achieve the intended result.

Art Unit: 2176

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to

(703)-746-7239 (**formal** communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703)-746-7238 (**informal** communications labeled **PROPOSED** or

DRAFT)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:


Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jeffrey ROSSI whose telephone number is (703) 308-5213 . The Examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays from 0830 to 1730 EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Heather HERNDON, can be reached on (703) 308-5186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JAR


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100